

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X

RAHUL MANCHANDA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

23 **CIVIL** 9292 (JPC)(KHP)

JUDGMENT

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE CHIEF
ABIGAIL REARDON, STAFF ATTORNEY REMI SHEA,
CHIEF COUNSEL JORGE DOPICO, JUDGE ROLANDO
ACOSTA, NYPD, and FBI NYC FIELD OFFICE,

Defendants.

-----X

It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:** That for the reasons stated in the Court's Opinion and Order dated February 1, 2024, As another judge in this District recently observed, “Manchanda is not a stranger to this court.” *Manchanda v. Att’y Grievance Comm. for First Jud. Dep’t*, No. 23 Civ. 3356 (JLR), 2023 WL 3091787, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 26, 2023). From ECF, it appears that, since 2012, he has filed, as a *pro se* plaintiff, at least fifteen civil actions in this District. One judge of this District warned Plaintiff, almost nine years ago, “that the continued filing of frivolous or meritless lawsuits will result in an order barring Plaintiff from filing any new action in this Court without prior permission.” *Manchanda v. Bose*, No. 15 Civ. 2313 (VSB) (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 16, 2014), Dkt. 3 at 8-9 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1651). Less than two years ago, the Second Circuit similarly warned Plaintiff, when he “filed a *pro se* pleading in [an] appeal that contain[ed] racist and anti-Semitic comments” after “ha[ving] done so in the past,” “that the use of any similar language in future filings in this Court will result in sanctions, regardless of whether the filing is otherwise duplicative, vexatious, or meritless.” *Manchanda v. Senderoff*, No. 21-1909, 2022 WL 167261, at *1 (2d Cir. Mar. 24, 2022) (unpublished). Once again, Plaintiff’s Amended

Complaint in this case was not only patently without merit, but also contained offensive and anti-Semitic accusations. This case unfortunately demonstrates that the actions of Plaintiff—an attorney who certainly should know to conduct himself better—have not improved. For the reasons set forth above, the Court dismisses *sua sponte* Plaintiff’s federal claims (*i.e.*, the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Causes of Action)—without prejudice only to the extent that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, as detailed above, *see supra* III.B.2—declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his state law claims (*i.e.*, the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Causes of Action) and dismisses those claims, and denies Plaintiff leave to amend his Amended Complaint. Judgment is entered in favor of Defendants; accordingly, the case is closed.

Dated: New York, New York

February 1, 2024

RUBY J. KRAJICK

Clerk of Court

BY:

K. Mango

Deputy Clerk